

should apparently be "invitational". Page 5, line 17, "envelops" should apparently be "envelopes". Page 8, line 15, "envelops" should apparently be "envelope". Appropriate correction is required.

Proper correction is done in amendments.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §112

3. **Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35U.S.C. 112,second paragraph,....**

Claims 1-4 are deleted and new claim 5 is added.

4. **Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Dolce (U.S. Patent No. 4,769,934).**

Dolce shows in figures 1-4 a front panel (16) having an opening, a back panel (14) having adhesives (40), and an embroidered fabric (12,13) located between the front and back panels [with a space developed by the side (28) of stretcher bar]

In this invention, a first portion (14) of a card stock having an window (12) and peel off glue (13-1), a second portion of the card stock (15), and an embroidered fabric (24) located between the first portion (14) and the second portion (15) of the card stock without any space.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by McGaver (U.S. Patent No. 5,727,490).

McGaver shows in figures 2a-2c a front panel (49) having an opening, second and thirds panels (50,51) having adhesive (48), and an embroidered fabric (44,46) located between the front and second panel. **The front panel, second panels and third panels are separately prepared.**

This invention claims the method of production, not a concept.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a), which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this office action.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolce. Dolce discloses the.....Dolce would work equally well.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolce. Dolce discloses the..... Dolce would work equally well.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGaver (U.S. Patent No. 5,727,490). McGaver shows in figures 2A-2Ctaught by McGaver would work equally well.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGaver (U.S. Patent No. 5,727,490) in view of Blanchard (U.S. Patent No. 4,275,517). Blanchard shows in figures 1-7 the idea of making the card in the form of four panels and enclosing a display therein..... McGaver would work.